REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 2, and 4-21 are amended. The remaining claims are unchanged. No new matter has been added.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1, 2, and 4-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

However, in order to expedite the prosecution of this application, claims 1, 2, and 4-21 have been amended to recite a "computer-readable **storage** medium." Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,832,243, Mikalsen et al. (hereinafter Mikalsen). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-29 are not anticipated by Mikalsen for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1, by way of example, defines a computer-readable storage medium having code stored thereon, the code executable by a processor to perform a computer-implemented method of operating a message exchange network. Claim 1 recites the features of:

> defining a plurality of event categories, **each event category of said plurality of event categories being associated with a different one of a plurality of stages of messaging between a message sender and a message recipient, said stages of said messaging including posting of a message, routing of a message, delivery of a message, and response to a delivered message;**
> detecting an error condition during messaging between a message sender and a message recipient;
> **coordinating said error condition with an identified one of said stages of said messaging;**
> **generating an alert message indicating said error condition and said identified stage of said messaging; and**
> transmitting said alert message to said message recipient.

(Emphasis added).

Embodiments of claim 1 may provide certain benefits as described in the specification:

> [0024] In the illustrated embodiment, the message routing system associates events having one or more similar characteristics with a particular event category. . . . In the illustrated embodiment, the

message routing system defines a set of event categories to group events that can occur at different stages of messaging. In particular, the message routing system can define event categories to group events associated with posting of a message, routing of a message, delivery of a message, and response to a delivered message.

[0025] Events associated with posting of a message can correspond to conditions associated with posting of a request message or a notification message by a message sender, such as, for example, posting errors due to invalid message headers, message size violations, and so forth. Events associated with routing of a message can correspond to conditions associated with routing of a request message or a notification message to a message recipient, such as, for example, routing errors due to permissions violations, policy enforcement, validity of the message recipient, and so forth. Events associated with delivery of a message can correspond to conditions associated with delivery of a response message or a notification message to a message recipient, such as, for example, delivery errors due to failure to connect to the message recipient, security violations, and message expirations. Events associated with response to a delivered message can correspond to, for example, a timeout error where the message recipient fails to respond to a request message within a particular time interval or a message error where the message recipient sends a response message indicating a processing error.

Mikalsen fails to disclose or suggest several of the above-recited features of claim 1. First, Mikalsen fails to teach the feature of "<u>each event category of said plurality of event categories being *associated* with a different one of a plurality of stages of messaging</u> between a message sender and a message recipient" (emphasis added). Nowhere does Mikalsen describe, for example, the failure conditions described in col. 3, l. 18-22 as being associated with a different one of a plurality of stages of messaging. Instead, Mikalsen only describes these values as representing "**delivery** failure conditions." (col. 4, l. 28-39, emphasis added) There is no teaching or suggestion in Mikalsen that these failure conditions could be associated with a different one of a plurality of stages of messaging, such as "posting," "routing," "delivery," and "response," as recited in claim 1. Thus, Mikalsen does not teach event categories being associated with a different one of a plurality of stages of messaging, as recited in claim 1.

Second, because Mikalsen fails to teach event categories associated with a different one of a plurality of stages of messaging, as explained above, Mikalsen fails to disclose or suggest additional features of claim 1, such as "**coordinating** said error condition with an identified one of said stages of said messaging" (emphasis added). Mikalsen does not disclose that, for example, modification of failure conditions (col. 5, l. 58-61) includes coordinating an error condition with an identified one of a plurality of stages of messaging. Instead, Mikalsen teaches

"[d]elivery observation and failure evaluation" during or after sending a message. (col. 5, 1. 58-61).

Third, because Mikalsen fails to teach event categories associated with a different one of a plurality of stages of messaging, as explained above, Mikalsen fails to disclose or suggest additional features of claim 1, such as "generating an alert message indicating said **error condition** and **said identified stage** of said messaging." (emphasis added). Mikalsen does not disclose that, for example, notifying the message sender about the outcome of the evaluation of the failure conditions (col. 5, 1. 1-8) includes generating an alert message indicating an error condition and an identified one of a plurality of stages of messaging. Instead, Mikalsen discloses only that the sender is notified about the outcome of an evaluation of "a message delivery as successful or failed." (col. 4, 1. 66-67; col. 5, 1. 1-8).

Therefore, Mikalsen cannot be said to anticipate the invention defined in claim 1, because Mikalsen fails to disclose or suggest several features of claim 1, as explained above. Claims 2, 3, and 27 recite similar features as claim 1 and thus are also not anticipated by Mikalsen for at least the reasons discussed above. The various dependent claims incorporate all of the features of the independent claims on which they are based and, therefore, are not anticipated for at least the reasons discussed above. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

<div style="text-align: right">

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/John F. Griffith/

John F. Griffith
Reg. No. 44,137

</div>

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100